Today's topics:

- **Morpheme alternations**
- **Determining morpheme URs**

Background preparation:

- *Odden (2004) excerpts*
- *Data sets: Turkish, Javanese*

0. Today's objectives

After today's class, you should be able to:

- Apply the concept of predictable distribution in the context of morphological alternations

- Propose and defend a UR for an alternating morpheme

- Identify cases of neutralization in morpheme alternations, and discuss the relevance for proposing URs

1. Warm-up: Phonemes and distribution

- If the distribution of sounds X and Y is **predictable**, which is more likely?

    (a) X and Y are allophones of the same phoneme

    (b) X and Y belong to different phonemes

1. Warm-up: Phonemes and distribution

- Which of these do we want our model of the **mental grammar** to do?
    - (a) Determine which words have a certain allophone of a given phoneme
    - (b) Determine which words have a certain phoneme

1. Warm-up: Phonemes and distribution

- What is the connection between the two previous questions?

2. Alternating morphemes

- Data set – <u>Javanese</u>

  - Which morphemes alternate?

  - What URs should we propose?

  - What does the grammar need to do for the other surface forms?

2. Alternating morphemes

- Data set – <u>Turkish suffixes</u>

  - Which morphemes alternate?

  - What URs should we propose?

  - What does the grammar need to do for the other surface forms?

2. Alternating morphemes

- When we see an alternating morpheme, how do we **choose the UR**?

  - Consider the **alternative analyses**

    (what does the grammar have to do under different UR assumptions?)

  - Is one analysis more **successful** than other(s)?

3. More on morpheme alternations

- Here are some things to watch out for in analyzing morpheme alternations (see also Odden 2004):

    - Don't assume that a paradigm form with no affixes "is" the UR

    - Avoid proposing rules with exceptions when an alternative, general analysis is possible

- What would examples of these errors be in the analysis of Javanese?

3. More on morpheme alternations

- Here are some things to watch out for in analyzing morpheme alternations (see also Odden 2004):

    - Don't try to derive one surface form from another (in the absence of evidence that this is necessary)

        - What should we do instead?

        - Hint: What is the starting point for a morphologically complex surface form?

- What would examples of these errors be in the analysis of Javanese? (Consider also Spanish verbs)

4. Morpheme alternations and neutralization

- Zsiga (2013) and Odden (2005) both discuss (positional) **neutralization**
  - What is neutralization?
  - Why is it important in determining URs?

4. Morpheme alternations and neutralization

- Odden (2005: 68):

  "Neutralizing rules, on the other hand, are ones where two or more underlyingly distinct segments have the same phonetic realization in some context because a rule changes one phoneme into another —thus the distinction of sounds is neutralized."

  - Any thoughts on Odden's wording?

4. Morpheme alternations and neutralization

- Zsiga (2013: Ch 10, p 214):

  "The most complicated and confusing distribution may be *positional neutralization*. In this case, two sounds are contrastive in one position, and not contrastive in another. The two sounds still belong to two different phonemes: if minimal pairs exist, the sounds are capable of beaing contrast. But that contrast may be neutralized in certain positions."

4. Morpheme alternations and neutralization

- Where do we see neutralization in today's data sets?

  - Javanese

  - Turkish suffixes

- What are the **implications** for neutralization in choosing URs?